

PERMANENT COMMUNITY IMPACT FUND BOARD MEETING

Department of Workforce Services
Housing and Community Development Division
Salt Lake City, Utah

Minutes

Thursday, September 8, 2016

Members Present

Keith Heaton
Bruce Adams
Steve Farrell
Jae Potter
Gregg Galecki
Jim Matson
Ron Winterton
Naghi Zeenati
Garth "Tooter" Ogden
Michael McKee

Chairman
Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments
State Board of Water Resources
Carbon County
State Board of Water Quality
Five County Association of Governments
Uintah Basin Association of Governments
State Transportation Commission
Six County Association of Governments
Uintah County

Excused Members

David Damschen

State Treasurer

Staff and Visitors

Jonathan Hardy
Candace Powers
Gayle Gardner
Shad West
Cristine Rhead
Brenda Brown
Kimberley Schmeling
Kyle Slaughter
Flint Timmons
Katherine Smith
Wade Farraway
Nathan Hall
Max Jensen
Keith Despain
Larry Henley
Daren Anderson
Mark Reidhead
Ben Mower
Monty Pratt
M. Darrin LeFevre
Kevin Yack
Douglas Nielsen
Aaron Averett
Justen Atkinson
Kelly Pehrson
Frank Darcey

Housing and Community Development
Housing and Community Development
Housing and Community Development
Housing and Community Development
Housing and Community Development
Housing and Community Development
Housing and Community Development
Housing and Community Development
Housing and Community Development
Housing and Community Development
Housing and Community Development
Attorney General's Office
Division of Drinking Water
Ouray Park Water Improvement District
CRS Engineers
Ballard Water & Sewer Improvement District
CRS Engineers
Ballard Water & Sewer Improvement District
Ballard Water & Sewer Improvement District
Jensen Water Improvement District
Toquerville City
Uintah Basin Association of Governments
Sunrise Engineering
Sunrise Engineering
Sunrise Engineering
San Juan County
San Juan Spanish Valley Special Service District

Shannon Ellsworth
Ken Curtis
Craig Dutson
Travis Kyhl
Michael Bryant
Brian Carver
Amy Ivie
Nate McDonald
Jewel Kloth
Brian Barton
Dave Roberts
Josh Jones
Don Landes
David Hatch
Ryan Goodrich
Eric Johnson
Carson DeMille
Mike Hansen

Rural Community Consultants
Oak City
Oak City
Six County Association of Governments
Southeastern Utah Association of Local Governments
Bear River Association of Governments
United States Department of Agriculture
Department of Workforce Services
Best Engineering
Jones & DeMille Engineering
Henrieville Town
Parowan City
Parowan City
Ashley Valley Water & Sewer Improvement District
Ashley Valley Water & Sewer Improvement District
Blaisdell, Church & Johnson
Jones & DeMille Engineering
Rural Community Consultants

WELCOME

The Permanent Community Impact Fund Board (CIB) Meeting was held Thursday, September 8, 2016 at the Workforce Services Building, 1385 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah and called to order at 8:30 a.m. by Chairman Keith Heaton.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Financial Review

Candace Powers reviewed the status of the funds for today's meeting. There are eight new projects and one Special Consideration project on today's agenda.

Review of Agenda Items

Candace Powers reviewed the agenda with the Board members.

I. INTRODUCTIONS

Chairman Heaton welcomed everyone and asked the Board members and staff to give introductions.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Heaton requested a motion to approve the minutes from the August 18, 2016 meeting.

Steve Farrell made and Naghi Zeenati seconded a motion to approve the minutes of August 18, 2016 as corrected. The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Heaton noted that available funds are still low. Given the financial situation there is money to loan but very little grant money available.

III. NEW PROJECTS

1. Jensen Water Improvement District (Uintah County)

Jensen Water Improvement District's request is a \$146,000 loan for 30 years at 0.0% interest and a \$200,000 grant (total \$346,000) for a waterline replacement project. The project consists of water system improvements to include 5,750 linear feet of 8" waterline and appurtenances at approximately 6500 South and 7500 East and 3500 South and 2500 East, 5 new fire hydrants, asphalt surface repair and a new PRV Station.

The applicant has withdrawn the application.

2. Ashley Valley Water and Sewer Improvement District (Uintah County)

Ashley Valley Water and Sewer Improvement District presented a funding assistance request for a \$534,000 loan for 30 years at 0.0% interest and an \$800,000 grant (total \$1,334,000) for fire hydrant and fire flow upgrades. The project consists of water system upgrades to include replacing 4" waterline with 4500 linear feet of 8" waterline in the Rock Point area, 1500 East and 2000 East and replacing 6" waterline with 5500 linear feet of 10" waterline on 2000 East. The project also includes 25 new fire hydrants, SCADA improvements, installing a Master Meter and 2 Air-Vac valves.

As part of their services, the district supplies fire suppression water to most of the areas inside its district boundaries. This application addresses the fire flow needs in three areas where the line size and hydrant spacing is inadequate.

The project is a preemptive project. The District supplies fire suppression water to most of the areas inside its district boundaries. As the community grows, needs arise to provide increased flows to some areas in the District.

The Board was concerned that the loan being requested is for 0.0% interest. The applicant was asked if they could take a loan with an interest rate of 1.5% interest or 2.5% interest. The Board also asked if the water rate could be raised.

Ron Winterton made and Jim Matson seconded a motion to place the project on the Priority List for funding consideration at the October 6, 2016 funding meeting as a \$667,000 loan for 30 years at 1.5% interest and a \$667,000 grant (total \$1,334,000).

The Board suggested maintaining consistency on interest rates.

Naghi Zeenati made and Steve Farrell seconded a substitute motion placing the project on the Priority List for funding consideration at the October 6, 2016 funding meeting as a \$667,000 loan for 30 years at 2.5% interest and a \$667,000 grant (total \$1,334,000). The motion carried with five ayes (Farrell, Galecki, Zeenati, Ogden, Potter) and four nays (Adams, McKee, Matson, Winterton).

3. Ouray Park Water Improvement District (Uintah County)

Ouray Park Water Improvement District presented a funding assistance request for a \$1,926,000 grant for water system improvements to include installing 22,000 linear feet of 6 inch waterline, valves and appurtenances along 5500 South, 9 new fire hydrants, a chlorine analyzer/booster, 110 radio read meters, a new PRV station, upgrading 2 PRV stations, asphalt surface repair, and the construction of a 1,500 square foot office building.

The Ouray Park Water Improvement District was formed in the early 1970's and serves the rural area surrounding Pelican Lake in western Uintah County, north of Seep Ridge Road. The District purchases all of its water from the Ute Tribe and it is delivered to a single location with enough pressure to fill the lower tanks most of the time.

The latest DEQ inspection in 2015 did not find any significant deficiencies and the capacity calculations show they have sufficient storage and source capacity. As the existing water meters require replacement, they should be replaced with radio read technology.

The Water Improvement District indicated the building where they hold their meetings is shared with other community offices and it is sometimes difficult to hold meetings as needed. The District documents are currently stored at the secretary's home. A new office building would facilitate meeting space and a secure storage space for documents.

The Board referred to diminished mineral lease revenue and suggested the applicant revise the scope of the project to exclude the building and associated engineering costs and perhaps phasing the project.

Greg Galecki made and Tooter Ogden seconded a motion to place the project on the Pending List.

After further board discussion, a substitute motion was made.

Mike McKee made Ron Winterton seconded a substitute motion placing the project on the Priority List for funding consideration at the October 6, 2016 as a \$1,600,000 grant excluding the building. The motion failed with four ayes (Matson, McKee, Winterton, Potter) and five nays (Farrell, Galecki, Zeenati, Adams, Ogden).

The Chairman called the question on the original motion.

Greg Galecki made and Tooter Ogden seconded the original motion placing the project on the Pending List. The motion carried unanimously.

4. Ballard Water and Sewer Improvement District (Uintah County)

The Ballard Water and Sewer Improvement District presented a funding assistance request for a \$600,000 loan for 30 years at 2.5% interest and a \$1,865,000 grant (total \$2,465,000) for a new 1 million gallon water tank project. The project consists of the removal of a 42-year old 200,000 gallon water tank that is in need of repair and replacing it with a 1 million gallon concrete water tank, tank vault, outlet box, tank controls, leak detection system, 300 linear feet of 8" water line and 800 linear feet of site fencing. The applicant is contributing \$10,000 cash to this project.

The applicant stated that the 42 year old tank is leaking. This project will provide a total of 1,500,000 gallons of storage ability. The current residents pay moderately high water rates and connection fees and neither can be raised enough to cover the full cost of the project.

The Board asked the applicant if they have water rights and property for the project.

The applicant indicated that they do have the water rights and they are waiting for finalization of the land.

The Board noted the significant increase in storage capacity (1,000,000 gallons) and asked if a smaller tank might be adequate.

The applicant indicated that in 2011 an updated water master plan identified the need for 1,080,000 gallons of storage to meet the Division of Drinking Water standards with 3% growth. Based on the residential and commercial connections, the district needs approximately 1.5 million gallons of storage.

Mike McKee made and Bruce Adams seconded a motion placing the project on the Priority List for funding consideration at the October 6, 2016 funding meeting as a \$600,000 loan for 30 years at 2.5% interest and a \$1,865,000 grant (total \$2,465,000) as requested. The motion carried unanimously.

5. San Juan Spanish Valley Special Service District (San Juan County)

The San Juan Spanish Valley Special Service District presented a funding assistance request for a \$1,000,000 loan for 30 years at 0.0% interest and a \$1,550,000 grant (total \$2,550,000) for the installation of a new culinary water system in the Spanish Valley to include 230 service connections, a 500,000 gallon concrete storage reservoir, 80 fire hydrants, 800 linear feet of 6-foot chain link fencing, a 16-foot wide chain link gate, a 3-foot wide chain link gate, 4,600 linear feet of 12-inch PVC pipe, 5,400 linear feet of 10-

inch PVC pipe, 61,500 linear feet of 8-inch PVC pipe, 7 PRV stations, well development and testing, well house, electrical, and road repair.

The applicant stated that the Spanish Valley District currently includes individual wells and septic tanks which are mostly unregulated. The District has obtained 500 acre feet of water rights to drill a community well in Spanish Valley and will monitor the impacts of the large well on the heavily used aquifer. A new culinary water system for the 230 existing homes in the area will be implemented. Public meetings have indicated a positive response to the project.

The Board asked why the engineering fees were so high.

The applicant stated that the implementation process of a new system is quite involved.

The Board asked about the status of DEQ funding for this project, which is in place and discussed funding.

Naghi Zeenati made and Tooter Ogden seconded a motion placing the project on the Priority List for funding consideration at the October 6, 2016 funding meeting as a \$638,000 loan for 30 years at 2.5% interest and a \$1,912,000 grant (total \$2,550,000). The motion carried unanimously.

6. Oak City (Millard County)

Oak City presented a funding assistance request for \$175,000 loan for 30 years at 0.0% interest and a \$350,000 grant (total \$525,000) for redeveloping six spring collection sites in the Oak Creek Mountain area to include upgrading the access road, excavating the collection area, running new collection lines, new collection manholes, a booster station, a new 300 GPM well pump in the City's existing water well, electrical hookups, 1,500 linear feet of fencing and six 16' gates. The applicant is contributing \$175,000 cash to the project.

The applicant indicated that Oak City cannot provide water to many more homes with the current capacity of their existing well and springs. Spring flows have begun to decrease from aging and from damage that occurred after the recent wildfires. Residents on the south side of town were annexed in and the water pressure is very low. Fire hydrants do not have enough pressure. Roots and soil erosion have contributed to the problem and the springs did not pass inspection.

The Board suggested withdrawing their applicant cash and increasing the loan request as CIB has loan funding.

The applicant stated they cannot afford additional debt and would prefer the requested grant/loan mix.

The Board indicated that their cash could facilitate the loan payments; the community has a high MAGI and low water rates. High engineering costs were attributed to additional permitting and environmental costs associated with this project.

Mike McKee made and Jae Potter seconded a motion placing the project on the Priority List for funding consideration at the October 6, 2016 funding meeting as a \$525,000 loan for 30 years at 2.5% interest. The motion carried unanimously.

7. Parowan City (Iron County)

Parowan City presented a funding assistance request for a \$13,500 grant for an implementation study. The project consists of receiving formal consulting services and a professional strategic plan that includes a priorities workshop, implementation strategy and a general plan review which is intended to enhance the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of the City's general plan. The applicant is contributing \$13,500 as matching funds for the study.

Bruce Adams made and Steve Farrell seconded a motion placing the project on the Priority List for funding consideration at the October 6, 2016 funding meeting as a \$13,500 grant.

Mike McKee made a substitute motion for the Rural Planning Group to provide the implementation study.

It was indicated by the Rural Planning Group that with the RPG's current schedule, the earliest available time for the study would be spring of next year. Mike McKee withdrew his motion.

The Chairman called the question on the original motion.

Bruce Adams made and Steve Farrell seconded the original motion placing the project on the Priority List for funding consideration at the October 6, 2016 funding meeting as a \$13,500 grant. The motion carried unanimously.

8. Toquerville City (Washington County)

Toquerville City presented a funding assistance request for a \$44,500 grant for a general plan update and transportation master plan consisting of an update to the 10 year old general plan to include housing, infrastructure and land use objectives and a transportation master plan to determine major traffic issues and mitigate impacts of increased tourist traffic and a bypass corridor study. The applicant is contributing \$19,500 applicant cash and \$25,000 Dixie Metro Planning Organization (MPO) funding to the project.

The applicant stated that Toquerville City's general plan is 15 years old and needs updating. The transportation plan will assess transportation and consideration of a bypass road around the City's main street. The completed plan will be submitted to UDOT. As for the RPG accommodating this plan, the MPO funding would expire before the RPG could provide assistance.

The Board suggested that the plans could be implemented for a reduced cost.

The applicant indicated that plans are to be provided in a format UDOT and MPO requires.

Bruce Adams made and Jim Matson seconded a motion placing the project on the Priority List for funding consideration at the October 6, 2016 funding meeting as a \$44,500 grant. The motion carried unanimously.

IV. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION

1. Town of Henrieville (Garfield County)

The Town of Henrieville presented a funding assistance request for a \$337,500 grant for emergency culinary water improvements consisting of replacing 4 inch pipe and associated air valves with 34,000 linear feet of 6 inch HDPE pipe, installing 6 inch turnout pipe at the chlorinator and adding a low water level alarm on the water tank, reconstructing a manhole cover, removing and replacing 100 linear feet of fencing, and hydrogeological and source evaluation. The applicant is contributing \$13,500 cash to the project and is requesting the Board suspend the rules and fund the project at today's meeting.

The applicant stated that in the spring, there was a total loss of water in the well due to an air lock which caused a health hazard and citizens had to boil their water. Currently there is an inadequate water supply, water pressure continues to be low. It appears that an air valve located immediately downstream of the well had been shut off since the time of construction in 2004. Further inspection found leaks in the lines.

The Board asked whether this was due to a manufacturer defect or a natural disaster.

The applicant indicated uncertainty as to what caused the break in the line but low flows continue to be tracked through the transmission line.

The applicant stated that Henrieville Town currently has one source of culinary water and needs to obtain an additional source. A hydrologic and source evaluation will be completed to determine the best course of action to pursue an additional water source. The transmission line and air valves need to be replaced. A new turnout at the chlorinator will be constructed to allow for discharge of excess water back to the creek at the chlorinator site. An alarm system will also be installed.

Bruce Adams made and Jim Matson seconded a motion to suspend the rules and fund the project as a \$337,500 grant. The motion carried unanimously.

The Board suggested a discussion at the funding meeting regarding the percentage of engineering costs on projects.

V. BOARD MEMBER DISCUSSION

1. Planning & Studies Match Requirement

Chairman Heaton: Staff makes certain applications are complete and comply with rules established for CIB. When planning and study applications come in and do not have a 50% cash match, those applications are held. Staff does not approve or disapprove applications but they are tasked with making sure the applications are complete and comply with the established rules. The rule pertaining to planning states: "Planning grants and studies *normally* require a fifty percent cash contribution by the applicant." The practice and precedent of this Board has been to require a 50% match for every planning grant and though it says 'normally', heretofore it has always been required.

The question is how to deal with an application that does not meet the requirements.

Planning projects usually request smaller funding amounts and planning and studies have no revenue source for repayment, thus the applicant would participate with match. Infrastructure projects involve hundreds of thousands of dollars – even millions, which makes a match difficult, but usually have a revenue source and the Board can authorize loan funding.

Mike McKee: The rule says "normally". We do hear things under "Special Consideration". The Board serves best when there is flexibility. He indicated that there is some value in hearing some of these projects. The Six County Organization area has so much to do with oil and gas; revenue coming in to the Board itself. The ability we have to create such things as public/private partnerships and other things we want to do – it doesn't happen day one, but if we can move this forward and we can find ways to self-fund as we move down the road. There is value in having flexibility to bring them forward under special consideration. The staff could bring these applications to the Board and ask them if they want to hear them.

Jonathan Hardy: I appreciate what Commissioner McKee has said. Flexibility is good, but there is also a balance. We want to be consistent and apply the same standards within the parameters that you are given as a Board. There is a reason there are parameters outlined in your rules and laws that help guide going forward. We all want some flexibility, but in fairness to all the applications we see on a regular basis, consistency is an important element.

Gregg Galecki: That is what I would add: Getting some consistent guidelines.

Naghi Zeenati: I refer to the Board policy book before I come to this Board. Flexibility is good but at the same time, the public should receive fair treatment yesterday and today.

Bruce Adams: The Six County Organization has no ability to come up with matching funds. They're trying to get to the point where they have created some income. Until that organization gets up and running, it's incumbent upon the Board to work with them. Many of those Counties are the highest

producers; trying to remain high producers. If we make that rule hard and fast today, we are saying, "Six County, go away." Six County Coalition is trying to help this Board survive during tough times. The Board should be flexible until the Six County can come in with matching funds.

Mike McKee: We have to have vision. We can become anything we want to become if we are vision minded. (Reference was made to the resources in the Basin.) The Six County Organization is trying to have the ability to develop their resources, the ability to fund this board because frankly, this is where the money comes from. I don't want to have some rule that will keep them from doing what they are trying to do. A hard fast rule is narrow-minded.

Jae Potter: A few years ago we talked about large infrastructure projects. Those projects bring a whole different approach and uniqueness about them. They are not going to be cookie-cutter. We need vision to say, 'where does the economic strength come from for the State of Utah and also for Eastern Utah?' Monies already expended may be a better barometer than a hard fast rule of 50/50. The question is, 'why is the application coming to this board?' Is it because of lack of time and money or is it the next step required to go forward which releases gas, oil, coal, gilsonite, etc. We are being 'economically' pinched. It's not this Board's fault, it's just the economic environment. For me, there are those two steps; what has been done and what needs to be done, and what is it that applies to infrastructure.

Ron Winterton: Looking at past years, there were a lot more applicants put on the pending list. We put one there today, but that just doesn't happen because I think it's because staff does a really good job in what we say 'normally' is a complete application. But there are times when if the Board members think we should see one that the staff feels is not complete, we should be able to consider it, and the worst case is that it's going to be put on the pending list. But I think that the Board ought to hear it because it comes back to if we're trying to help the mineral production in the State, we need to consider those projects that'll do just that. If you look back to the rail study that we did in conjunction with UDOT; that study said what the State is going to leave on the table if they do nothing. That spurred a lot of discussion and thinking outside of the box. The staff does a really good job, but I think that we have enough people on this Board that think outside of the box; what are the possibilities if we do this. I would put up that if there are projects like this, if there's enough Board members that feel we ought to hear it, whether it's complete or not, let's do it; let's screen it.

Jim Matson: In looking at what we're about and what we're trying to accomplish, for me personally it's a lot easier to think about how we generate more revenue and therefore have more to enjoy across the board as such. I think we would all be better served if there was more revenue in total and I think we ought to be looking and seeking those sources even if there's some sense of uncertainty [as to] what might be possible; whether it's market driven or it's the prospect of a given project. I think the debate is really important and if we discuss that thoroughly to the extent that we do all that we can to assure ourselves we haven't left anything in the ground. I'd like to see us either approach from the standpoint of how we deal with the rule itself and clarify some of this or in the operations and the way we go about our business and be able to create those opportunities that last longer.

Naghi Zeenati: In the past few meetings as I've read the minutes at some of these meetings, the discussion was one to five minutes if any and the attendance was one or two people. Are they just meeting for the purpose to formally tell us that they have met as part of the obligation for application or are they really announcing and posting the public hearing, that the public was really involved in the discussion of how much loan, how much grant, how much interest rate and is the project good for the community. I have never seen any meeting more than five minutes. I don't know how you fix the public hearing.

Mike McKee: Mr. Zeenati brings up a good point. Public hearings are advertised, they're in the paper, you encourage people to come, you hope people come. Sometimes you might get maybe 10 or 12. Six County meetings we get a little more than that because it's coming from six counties. In smaller communities, the people that are required to be there are usually there but that's about it. It is a

challenge. At least there is a public process. People can't say I didn't know about it; it's in the paper, it's been advertised and I think that's at least what we're trying to do. Let's make sure people can't come back and say there wasn't good transparency; we didn't give people a good opportunity. Maybe we can do more, but at least there's a strong effort to say we have good transparency.

Jonathan Hardy: This is a good discussion. I'm glad we're getting it all on the table. I would say one reason there isn't a lot of participation is that all of us vote with our wallets. There's no tax or fee imposed on the general public for membership in the Six County Infrastructure Coalition. So I don't think you are going to get a whole lot of public participation unless you say you are raising a fee or raising their taxes or putting those types of things on the table. I don't disagree with the fact that everything is public as it should be. I just don't think there's going to be a process whereby we're putting skin in the game. I think it gets to the point of why we've had the 50/50 match on the planning grants is that the whole concept of skin in the game is that you believe in the project as much as you want the Board to believe in the project you're bringing forward; I appreciate the fact that there's no revenue source right now but I think this is the standard we need to set for future inter-locals I think that's a standard we need to come up with; who is putting the skin in the game besides the Board and the reason why you have the match. That is the whole purpose of an inter-local is to merge entities together – to put skin in the game for the purpose of the organization. If we go forward with unlimited flexibility on any inter-local coming in that doesn't have a revenue source; if that's a standard we're setting, that's probably not the standard we want to hold to long term. I'm supportive of the ways that we can generate revenue for the Board but you'll notice that all the applications we consider, that's not the consideration we take for funding those projects; it's for the public infrastructure. It's for those communities that are impacted. That is the primary mission of the Board. These are ancillary things that are going to help the revenue to the Board long term, and I appreciate that and I certainly want to see the fund grow, because we can do more projects for the community but I would hope that we have a little bit more understanding about what those parameters are.

Tooter Ogden: There could be something on the application that is revenue based. What's the project going to do long-term for CIB. With big applications, it should be linked somehow to what you are doing for mineral extraction; oil, gas, coal...whatever.

Chairman Heaton: As a Board, I think we do a pretty good job looking at the impact; mitigating the impact but also the other side of that; is it going to facilitate continuing the resource. That's something that individual Board members have done a good job at looking at. We are certainly interested in entertaining any specific ideas you have for amending the application. I can't think of how you do that yet, but I do know that revenue is something we all look at in each application.

Mike McKee: The other question I have, and it's kind of a broader discussion, and that has to do with how items get on the agenda? I'm going to do this broadly for a minute. If you're in a County Commission, the Commissioners take turns being chair. When I've been the chair of the County Commission, any County Commissioner that wants an item on the agenda, whether I agree with it or disagree, it goes on an agenda. If it's something that's important to one of the County Commissioners, I will put it on the agenda for discussion. I had Heather Hoyt, this was some months ago, look at State law and how do we get items on the agenda. Essentially, if you look at various State boards it appeared that generally if there were three Board members that wanted something on an agenda, it could be put on an agenda. And, but when you look at the CIB Board itself, it was... the old law, the controlling law it appeared to be three, but it was updated this year so it was a little unclear, but a lot of the other State Boards stayed with three Board members. We talk about just how we put things on an agenda. I do believe there is value. This is the CIB Board. If there's something important for Board members to be able to put on there, I think they ought to have the ability to do it.

Chairman Heaton: I can only speak with certainty going back 15 months, but to my knowledge, there has never been an item that the chairman has not placed on the agenda, so we may be looking for a solution to a problem that doesn't exist. The issue here was the match requirements, specifically with planning, but

any incomplete application. I think what you suggested in the beginning, Commissioner McKee, is wholly appropriate. We'll bring it to the Board's attention and then put it under Special Consideration, so that it does requires the vote to be considered. That gives everyone an ample opportunity to say this is why it's being placed under special consideration. As far as the language 'normally' that is in administrative rule so that can be changed. If everyone is agreeable to bringing the application in question, and future applications that are similar under special consideration that is how we will move forward. Not withholding something from the agenda unless the Boards desire is not to hear it.

.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Permanent Community Impact Fund Board will be on Thursday, October 6, 2016 at the Multi-Agency State Office Building, 195 North 1950 West, Salt Lake City, in the Department of Environmental Quality Boardroom.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Submitted by:
Cristine Rhead